

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed April 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0018913 to Brezak et al. and rejected claims 3 and 6-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,331 to Kato.

In the Final Rejection mailed on October 16, 2006, the Examiner cites to three paragraphs in Brezak et al. to support the rejection. Paragraph [0035] states “having possession of a client’s ticket granting ticket (TGT) and associated authenticator allows the holder to request tickets on behalf of the client from the trusted third-party, e.g. a key distribution center (KDC).” The holder in this paragraph must have possession of a TGT and associated authenticator. This sentence fails to describe the holder as ISSUING a service ticket. Thus, this paragraph does not support the Examiner’s rejection.

In citing to paragraph [0045], the Examiner has misread that paragraph. Server A 210 transmits a service ticket as part of the TGS_REQ. However, server A 310 does not receiver requests for access information to access content in paragraph [0045]. Server A 210 only forwards identifying data as part of the TGS_REQ. Brezak et al. never equate this identifying data with the claimed access information. Also, it is not stated in Brezak et al. if server A 210 generates the identifying information itself or receives from another device.

Paragraph [0048] also does not support the Examiner’s rejection. Authentication service 206 does not issue a service ticket or receive a request for access information.

Instead, service 206 accesses information in a database. It accesses this information based on a service ticket received by another entity/

As stated previously, Brezak et al. does show a trusted third party (204) in Figure 2, this server does not BOTH issue service tickets AND receive requests for access information to access content.

With respect to claims 8 and 17, Applicant does not understand the Examiner's basis for the rejection. First, the Examiner asserts that Brezak et al. teaches "issuing a key reply" in paragraph [0048]. To what is Brezak et al. issuing a key reply? The Examiner appears to assert that Brezak et al. issue a key reply at random. Regardless, Applicant has amended claim 8 to include the fact that the key request is issued from a client. The messages 230 and 232 in Figure 2 of Brezak et al. are between the server A 210 and the trusted third party 204 and do not involve a message from a client.

Claims not specifically mentioned above are allowable due to their dependence on an allowed claim.

CONCLUSION

No fees are due for this response. However, the Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments of fees (including fees for petitions for extensions of time) under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 to account number 502117. Any overpayments should be credited to the same account.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application, withdrawal of the rejections made in the last Office Action and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. The Applicant's representative can be reached at the below telephone number if the Examiner has any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Rafie Shamsaasef et al.

____/Benjamin D. Driscoll/_____
Benjamin D. Driscoll
Reg. No. 41,571
Motorola, Inc.
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
P (215) 323-1840
F (215) 323-1300

____December 15, 2006____
Date